

SPEAK YOUR PIECE

Wants More About Radio

Editor, Daily Worker:

I am a teen-ager living in New York. My parents buy the Worker and the Daily Worker every day. They have informed me that they have done so quite often and want to also. I read the paper and enjoy it, learning new things, and helping form a small opinion on international, national, state, city, and local news.

I, like many other progressive children are not fortunate in having a large income coming home each week. Because of this I am unfortunately without a television set. To many adults this might seem a trivial matter, to me it isn't. I enjoy watching TV and like the shows, both comedy and dramatic. But, what's the use of talking about what you haven't got? The point I am trying to bring out is that being without a television I must listen to the radio only. There are some good shows on and I enjoy them. Frankly I get a little peeved at listening to Rock and Roll and so I look in some papers for a recommended show. The New York Times says: five music shows from 2:30 till 9 o'clock, a science fiction show (I always listen to), boxing at 10 and a few forums. The Daily Worker doesn't even have a space for radio!!! Occasionally you do recommend some things, but that is seldom. I wish you could explain this to me.

Under the circumstances I am told not to give my full name so I wish you would print the letter and you answer in the "Speak Your Piece" column. Thank you very much. —CHARLIE.

Urges Looking At America

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

What should be done by Americans believing in socialism? I suggest the following:

1. A new fresh look at American problems and developments.

2. Expressions of socialist principles (not "socialist blueprints," but general governing ideas) must be made far more explicit than they have been in the past. They must be arrived at by new study of existing social trends in the world, the American applications taking especially into account American conditions and the place of America in current world history. Formulas of the past, derived from limited experience of a few countries, must not be repeated by rote.

3. Peace must be courage-

ously guarded. All opportunities for scientific and cultural exchange with all countries must be promoted.

4. Criticism of trends within the socialist countries carries no threat of world war or of "discrediting socialism" under current conditions, but may lead to valuable lessons. It should certainly be continued. Above all, institutions existing within socialist countries, such as the CPSU, must not be confused with socialism itself; they must be criticized if they do not alter in response to social progress.

5. Fraternal relations between working people of different nations are greatly needed, in whatever form they may occur, however unorthodox the auspices. However, fraternal relations between Communist parties of different countries are condition-

al; they must be on an equal basis, and must serve progress, and otherwise should be shunned as not being truly fraternal.

6. Socialism, as a stage of growth of mankind, is not the solution of all, but only some of the problems of the human race. Hence, we must develop awareness, without undue speculation, of what will follow socialism. The concept of "transition from socialism to communism" has received little fresh thought for many years, and has indeed become quite a glib stereotype.

7. The problems of the socialist countries must be solved by the citizens of those countries. We must strongly oppose meddling from outside, but we must understand what the problems are. We are not the surgeons, but the medical students watching in the amphitheater.—M.K.

Middle East

(Continued from Page 1)

(3) Military assistance "if they desire such a system."

(4) Use of armed force to protect any Middle East nation attacked by "any nation controlled by international communism."

There was no definition of "international communism" by Dulles. But some recalled privately that the last time this phrase was used in connection with "saving" a small nation was in the case of Guatemala.

There were many misgivings expressed by Democratic Congressmen, but it is expected that the Democrats will in the main support the President's program, although they will amend it to meet certain surface criticisms.

Press agency dispatches from the middle east yesterday reported opposition in Egypt, Syria and Jordan to any intervention in the Middle East under the "Eisenhower Doctrine."

Comment in the Israeli press was also critical of the President's message to Congress asking blank-check powers for the right to intervene in the Middle East.

Davar, organ of Histadrut, the Labor federation, and the English-language Jerusalem Post, both criticized the plan on the grounds that it did not protect the interests of Israel against the Arabs.

Official British reaction was limited to welcoming the U.S. concern over the future of the area. The British press thought the plan was too little and too late, and said it failed to touch the basic problems of Middle East ferment — Arab nationalism.

French Foreign Minister Christian Pineau said last night before

flying to New York it was too early to make a final judgment on Eisenhower's plan, but "as a whole we like it very much."

As a matter of fact," Pineau said, "President Eisenhower has now taken up most of the solutions I have been defending for a long time myself."

SPLIT CITED

Most Soviet broadcasts and editorials emphasized the split between the U.S. and Britain and France. Broadcasts also pointed out that the U.S. was trying to replace British and French colonialism with U.S. colonialism.

The morning paper, Ya, in Madrid hailed the plan and said the important thing is that "Washington has taken a definite attitude of responsibility towards the fate of the Middle East."

Egypt, Syria, Jordan and other nations linked against the Baghdad Pact were opposed to any form of "intervention."

Some Japanese Government quarters hailed the plan for stating in "clear terms" where the United States stood. But the Japanese Socialist Party said the authority given the President "might result in provoking war if it is mistakenly used."

Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru warned of the danger of trying to fill any political vacuum in the Middle East and said military strength might protect the Middle East for a while but "could not solve the basic economic problems of the backward nations."

Turkish Premier Adnan Menderes, in an interview with the Milan Newspaper Corriere Della Sera, said Turkey greeted the doctrine "with the greatest satisfaction," but he warned the situation is still very dangerous because of the situation in Syria, Egypt's attitude and the Israel question.

In Damascus, Syrian official ri